20th March 1952]

THE HON. SRI J. L. P. ROCHE VICTORIA :—" No, Sir, there has been a change in policy even with regard to the other States. The Government of India are revising the grants given to the other States also according to their present policy."

Conversion of radium bromide into radium needles.

* 98 *Q.*—DR. P. V. CHERIYAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that, since my questions on the subject on April 16th, 1951, the Government have sent to the U.K. the radium bromide for conversion into radium needles;

(*b*) if so, whether the Government took the opinion of the Expert in Radiology on the subject before the radium bromide was despatched;

(*c*) if the answer to clause (*b*) is in the affirmative, whether he will be pleased to place on the table of the House the opinion of the Government Expert; and

(*d*) if the answer is in the negative, why the Government did not take such an opinion in spite of the assurance given on the floor of the House?

THE HON. SRI C. PERUMALSAMI REDDI :—(*a*) Yes, radium bromide was despatched to the U.K. for conversion into radium sulphate needles and not radium bromide needles.

" (*b*) As the Government had before them the considered opinion of the Committee of experts in August 1949 including the Director of the Barnard Institute of Radiology and also the experience gained in the use of radon from 1937 to 1941, they did not consider it necessary to obtain the opinion of a single expert alone.

" (*c*) The question does not arise.

" (*d*) After the assurance given in the House, Government examined the question again and were convinced that their decision that radium is more suitable and less dangerous than radon, was correct and in keeping with the latest literature available and in keeping with the latest trends in modern method of radiation treatment."

DR. P. V. CHERIYAN :—" Is the Hon. Minister aware that at present radon treatment is generally accepted to be much better than radium treatment? " 12-15 p.m.

THE HON. SRI C. PERUMALSAMI REDDI :—" But the opinion of the experts is otherwise."

DR. P. V. CHERIYAN :—" May I know the names of the experts who were consulted? "

[20th March 1952

THE HON. SRI C. PERUMALSAMI REDDI :—" The following persons have been consulted :—

(1) The Associated Director of Health, Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Chicago,

(2) Director, Queensland Radium Institute, Australia,

(3) Physicist in charge of Commonwealth X-ray and Radium Laboratory, University of Melbourne, Australia,

(4) Dr. Ralston Paterson, Director, Holt Radium Institute, Manchester."

DR. P. V. CHERIYAN :—" I have in my possession now a letter from the Chief Physicist, Melbourne University and he says that radon treatment is the best. That is the latest opinion."

THE HON. SRI C. PERUMALSAMI REDDI :—" Experts may differ. This is what is said by Dr. Paterson about the potentialities of the use of radium and radon in his well-thought out statement whether radium or radon should be adopted. He has given an extract from the book on the treatment of malignant diseases by radium and X-ray. In that, he says that radium is much better than radon."

Allegations against the President, Mupparru Panchayat Board, Eluru taluk, West Godavari.

* 99 *Q.*—SRI MOTHEY NARAYANA RAO (on behalf of Sri A. Govindacharyulu) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Food be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Hon. Minister and the Secretary to Government, Local Administration, the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards, Madras, and the District Panchayat Officer, West Godavari, Eluru, have received any petitions and representations, written and oral, containing serious allegations against Mr. Dasari Vandanam, President of the Mupparru Panchayat Board, Eluru taluk, West Godavari;

(*b*) whether the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards ordered the District Panchayat Officer, West Godavari, Eluru, under acknowledgments in his R.O.C. No. H4-32790/51, dated 8th June 1951 and R.O.C. No. 32790/51-H4, dated 24th August 1951, to conduct an enquiry into all the allegations contained therein after giving due notice to the petitioners and submit his report before 25th June 1951 and 10th September 1951;

(*c*) whether any enquiries have since been made in the manner and on the lines indicated therein and whether any report has been submitted before 25th June 1951;

(*d*) if so, from whom, when, where and by whom and on what dates the enquiries, if any, have been conducted, and if not, why not; and